

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing FIG. 10 is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet containing FIG. 10. The drawing FIG. 10 has been amended to correct a typographical error. In the fifth box down from the top, the word -- "SENDIND"-- has been changed to -- "SENDING" --.

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-23 were pending at the time of the Office Action. Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20 are currently amended. Claims 2, 13 and 21-23 are cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 24-25 are new. Accordingly, by this amendment, claims 1, 3-12, 14-20 and 24-25 are pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Amendments to Written Description

Applicant has amended the specification to conform with Fig. 21. No new matter has been added.

Amendments to the Drawings

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing FIG. 10 is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet containing FIG. 10. The drawing FIG. 10 has been amended to correct a typographical error. In the fifth box down from the top, the word -- "SENDIND"-- has been changed to -- "SENDING" --.

Claim Objections

Applicant has amended claims 11-12 to address the objections noted in the Office Action.

Rejections under § 112

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20 have been amended to improve readability thereof. It is believed that claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20, as amended herein, fully comply with the requirements of § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections under § 101

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20 have been amended herein. It is believed that claims 1, 3-12 and 14-20, as amended herein, fully comply with the requirements of § 101.

Rejections under § 102

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,830). This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to independent claim 1, as amended herein.

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented apparatus comprising:

“a plurality of checklist template files, at least one checklist template file of said plurality of checklist template files storing at least a first and a second record and each record comprising a reminder message and a relative time difference relative to a reference date and time; ...

said reminder message registration portion using said date and time of said schedule event information as said reference date and time;

said reminder message registration portion converting, for said each record of said corresponding checklist template file, said relative time difference to an absolute sending time based on said reference date and time;

said reminder message registration portion combining, for said each record of said corresponding checklist template file, said reminder message, said

absolute sending time, and said destination address to produce a combined record and thereby producing at least two combined records; ...

wherein said message sending portion sends, for each of said at least two combined records, said reminder message to said destination address upon arrival or passage of said absolute sending time; and

wherein, within said at least one checklist template file, said first record comprises a first reminder message and a first relative time difference relative to a first reference date and time and said second record comprises a second reminder message and a second relative time difference relative to said first reference date and time, and

wherein said first relative time difference is different from said second relative time difference.

Ford does not disclose the noted features of claim 1. In particular, Ford does not disclose checklist template files, at least one of which stores at least a first and a second record and each record comprising a reminder message and a relative time difference relative to a reference date and time. Further, Ford does not disclose combining, for said each record of said corresponding checklist template file, to produce a combined record thereby producing at least two combined records and sending, for each of said at least two combined records, said reminder message to said destination address upon arrival or passage of said absolute sending time.

Instead, Ford teaches potentially sending an e-mail message per a single “message format” of several various message formats (see Table 3). For each message format, Ford teaches determining a content and destination of a message specified by the action rule database and transmitting the content of the message (see Abstract). However, Ford does not disclose determining a content and destination of each of at least a first and a second message and transmitting the respective contents of the at least two messages. Rather, Ford discloses that each message format represents a message to be sent in support of calendar entries (see Col. 2, lines 42-45, and Col. 8, lines 15-18). Ford also discloses that each message format has a destination and a content (see Col. 8, line 23). Thus, Ford discloses sending at most one message per message format of the type listed in Table 3. Ford does not disclose sending more than one message per message format.

In contrast, Fig. 26 in the present application shows a checklist template file storing at least two records, each record comprising a reminder message and a relative time difference relative to a reference date and time.

Furthermore, Ford does not disclose sending a selected message format multiple times in support of a given calendar entry. Rather, in accordance with the message formats listed in Table 3, Ford discloses, by way of example, supporting a calendar entry that falls under the “meeting event” category (see Col. 13, lines 13-14). In this example, Ford discloses sending messages such as: (1) an e-mail to meeting participants and an automated conference room scheduler; (2) a command to a printer to print prior meeting minutes; (3) a command to the processor 104 to compile and execute a code sequence; and (4) any other user-defined machine-readable message transmission (see Col. 13, lines 13-22). In teaching that any other message transmission may be sent in addition to the message formats listed in (1)-(3), Ford does not disclose sending an e-mail message format more than once. Instead, Ford discloses sending an e-mail message format at most once. As previously explained, within selection of a given message format, Ford discloses sending only one message.

The steps shown in Fig. 5 in Ford are consistent with the disclosures noted above. Fig. 5 shows two possible types of tasks for each calendar entry: (1) search for information and (2) send message (see Col. 11, lines 57-60). Ford discloses that, if data of a given calendar entry of a given event category requires one or more “search information” actions, steps 612 and 614 are performed for each action (see Col. 11, line 66, to Col. 12, line 1). With respect to a “send message” action, however, Ford discloses that, in contrast to steps 612 and 614, step 610 leads to step 618, where the action dispatcher 406 directs the send broker 409 to send a machine-readable message (see Col. 12, lines 59-62). Ford discloses repeating step 618 for each message format that is required for the given event category, as specified by the action rule database (see Col. 12, lines 62-64). Thus, Ford discloses repeating step 618 across different message formats. However, Ford does not disclose repeating step 618 within a selected message format. As previously noted, e-mail is an example of a message format. Therefore, Ford discloses performing step 618 (i.e. sending a message) at most once within the e-mail message format.

In addition, Ford does not disclose that, within said at least checklist template file, said first relative time difference is different from said second relative time difference. In support of a meeting that is calendared, Ford discloses that reminder messages may be e-mailed to all meeting participants several minutes before the meeting (see Col 3, lines 57-59). Thus, Ford discloses sending the reminder message at a first time relative to the time of the meeting. However, Ford does not disclose sending a message at a second time relative to the time of the meeting, wherein the first time is different from the second time.

At least for the reasons explained, it is believed that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ford. At least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1, it is believed that claims 5 and 7-11 are not anticipated by Ford. At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1, it is also believed that new claim 24 is not anticipated by Ford.

Paragraph 10 of the Office Action rejects claims 12 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Levinson (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,260). This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to independent claim 12, as amended herein.

At least for reasons similar to those explained with respect to claim 1, it is believed that claim 12 is not anticipated by Levinson. For example, Levinson does not disclose “storing at least a first and a second record and each record comprising a reminder message and a relative time difference relative to a reference date and time,” as recited in claim 12. In addition, Levinson does not disclose “converting...said relative time difference to an absolute sending time based on said reference date and time,” as recited in claim 12.

In contrast, Levinson discloses receiving and managing a plurality of tasks, each task having an earliest start time, a latest stop time, and a duration for completing the event (see Abstract). The tasks disclosed in Levinson do not have a relative time difference relative to a reference date and time. As a result, Levinson does not disclose converting a relative time difference to an absolute sending time based on a reference date and time. Levinson also discloses scripts consisting of one or more specific tasks or appointments to be performed by a user (see Col. 6, lines 18-20). Again, Levinson does not disclose or suggest that these tasks and appointments have a relative time difference relative to a reference date and time.

At least for the reasons explained, it is believed that claim 12 is not anticipated by Levinson. At least by virtue of their dependency from claim 12, it is believed that claims 16-20 are not anticipated by Levinson. At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 12, it is believed that new claim 25 is not anticipated by Levinson.

Rejections under § 103

Paragraph 12 of the Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford further in view of Shaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,809, 242). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Shaw does not supply the features explained to be missing from Ford. At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1, it is believed that claim 3 is patentable over Ford further in view of Shaw.

Paragraph 13 of the Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford further in view of Kurtzman, II et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,944). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Kurtzman does not supply the features explained to be missing from Ford. At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1, it is believed that claim 4 is patentable over Ford further in view of Kurtzman.

Paragraph 14 of the Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously explained, it is believed that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ford under § 102(e). At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1, it is believed that claim 6 is patentable over Ford under § 103(a).

Paragraph 15 of the Office Action rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levinson further in view of Huemoeller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,855,006). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Huemoeller does not supply the features explained to be missing from Levinson. At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 12, it is believed that claim 14 is patentable over Levinson further in view of Huemoeller.

Paragraph 16 of the Office Action rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levinson further in view of Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,836,792). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Chen does not supply the features explained to be missing from Levinson. At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 12, it is believed that claim 15 is patentable over Levinson further in view of Chen.

At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1, it is believed that claim 24 is patentable over the cited references. At least by virtue of its dependency from claim 12, it is believed that claim 25 is patentable over the cited references.

At least for the reasons noted above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claims that are pending in this application.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 5, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By *David A. Blumenthal* 56,252
for /

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257